



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tractive collections of books upon subjects of special or passing interest, it provides printed lists of annotated titles to induce the readers to select the better books and encourages in every way the use of good books—but is it neglecting an opportunity to help the individual? Every public library can furnish illustrations of certain borrowers who have developed and advanced under the sympathetic guidance of some library friend, and these borrowers are perhaps but representatives from a large class which might be helped if a way could be found to offer something more in the way of individual suggestion, if not individual training.

Without formalizing in any way the work of the public library, without its becoming less broad in its sympathies, it may find it possible to arrange courses of reading with guidance which would attract some of its many desultory readers. In some departments, at least, there would be little difficulty in finding the right people to coöperate with the library in this kind of work.

A trained technical or vocational teacher would be of considerable value in the library to help with personal counsel and advice in their difficulties many of those who are using books more or less blindly in the continuation of their elementary technical study in connection with their work, and to arrange and supervise reading courses for the workers in various trades, arts and occupations.

It may sometime prove possible to have a teacher assigned by the school authorities for this duty, in the same manner as the library has often assigned an expert to help the library work in the schools.

A library reading course might well be arranged in academic studies, as well as vocational, under volunteer inspectors or advisers. "To every workman there are eager apprentices who are hungry to know, not his way, but the way. Every workman who does the best he can has a store of value for the younger ones, who are drawn, they know not why, to the production he represents. . . . I would have my country call upon every man who shows vision or fineness in any work to serve for an hour or two each day . . . telling the mysteries of his daily work."—Will Lexington Comfort.

Is it not possible that the public library can use its wonderful medium as a link between those eager to learn and the skillful, intelligent workers who know?

In the continued expansion of the work of the free public circulating library into that "untraveled world whose margin fades forever and forever," may it not go much further than it has yet gone toward supplying a need constantly apparent of many of our untrained readers? May it not think more seriously, broadly and sympathetically of responding to the definite needs of the individual, and make quantity in the circulation of books secondary to nourishing the more abundant life?

DEMOCRACY AND WORLD POLITICS*

By SHAILER MATHEWS, D. D., *Dean, Divinity School, University of Chicago*

Mr. President and Members of the Association: In coming before you at this time I ask you to consider a message which I hope may be of some significance to you and through you to the world to whom you

minister. Day before yesterday I was at one of the great training camps of the Officers' Reserve, where there were five thousand young men, the finest body of young men I ever saw together, and I have been with college students for thirty years. I saw their situation as I had never seen it

*Stenographic report of an extemporeous address.

LOUISVILLE CONFERENCE

before, and as one of the many fathers who have sons in those camps I realized the significance of the service which you can plan for these young men. When I think of the camps of five times the size of the Officers' Training Camp which are to be spread over this country, and realize the tremendous significance of those camps in Americanization, education in citizenship, strengthening of morale, I feel even more the significance of your service, which you can render as no other body of experts can render.

In a time like this we must not "continue business as usual." We must continue business as if the nation were at war. And what is true of the nation must be true of the spiritual life of the community, for we live in a day and a moment which is the culminating point of cumulative forces which run back many years. And it is to the struggle between democracy and Prussianism that I would call your attention as a background of the need of our day for your service.

If you go back to 1776 you see a world without constitutional government in any modern sense of the word. Even the constitutional life of England was a very imperfect, embryonic constitutional life as compared with that of Great Britain today. There were, it might almost be said, two Englands. On the one hand there had gradually been shaped an idea of political rights which found expression among Englishmen both in England and in our colonies. On the other hand, there had been developing, also, very largely under the influence of France and Prussia, a tory England with some attempt to reinvigorate ancient privileges. When George III came to the throne his mother said to him, "Now, George, be a king," and between his fits of insanity he undertook to be a king. Fortunately for the Whigs he had several attacks of insanity and the constitutional life of England was preserved by the freer England that was then developing. In one of those attempts at establishing the Prussian conception of monarchy he went a little too far with the English people on this side of

the water and there emerged the American Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution which gave birth to the United States of America. In the appearance of the United States of America with a written constitution safeguarding and extending the inherited rights of the English people to all citizens, there was saved not only freedom and independence and democracy in the United States, but democracy in England as well. For the battle between the insidious autocracy of the House of Hanover and the growing liberalism of Burke and his party really was fought at Yorktown, and the surrender at Yorktown not only gave us independence, it gave democracy to England. Now, in a very striking fashion, we stand before a similar situation. For one hundred years in Europe the crushing power of Prussian autocracy has been extended over German liberalism, and it is my hope and belief, in the light of history, that the victory of democracy which beats down Prussianism will be as significant to German liberalism as was the victory of democracy that beat down the House of Hanover in England. This war will do for the suppressed liberalism of Germany what the American Revolution did for the endangered liberalism and democracy of England. And when we appeal to the German-born American to have a part in this emancipation we are making the same appeal to him that was made to the English-born American in the War of Independence. For our victory will mean as much for German democracy as Yorktown meant to English democracy.

Two great tendencies have been in operation ever since those momentous days. There has been the constant spread of the American idea of democracy, a great fraternizing conception that has moved from state to state. We are thankful to France for what France did in assisting us in those dark days; but France gained from the American Revolution immeasurable benefits. The American Revolution led to the Republic of France, for among the prime movers in the French Revolution were those who had had experience on

American soil. They beat down feudalism and absolutism in France, and when the Constituent Assembly in France drew up at last, in 1791, a constitution for France, the second great written constitution in the world's history, it prefaced that constitution with the statement called "The declaration of the rights of man and the citizen." Whence came that immortal formulation? From the American colonies, who, gathering themselves together in little groups, dared to say, "We have rights not only as citizens, as Englishmen, but as church members;" and they proceeded to organize themselves and to promulgate "declarations of rights," such as the Virginia declaration of rights. From that great period there came a succession of declarations of rights, which finally had as progeny this French declaration of rights.

While this was going on in France, democracy was growing in Great Britain and gradually there, too, developed the power of the people. Reform bill followed reform bill until, at last, in the late sixties, England became a democracy, with a king, it is true, but a king who has no power of government except that permitted by a really sovereign Parliament.

Social movements come in waves. The course of history is never steady, and after the movement in the middle of the nineteenth century, a reaction occurred in nearly every country in Europe except Great Britain, until there came the marvelous year of 1848. France had been a stubborn devotee to democracy. It had yielded of necessity to restorations and *coups d' état*, but in 1848 it again became a republic, driving out its citizen king. Europe was ablaze with democratic enthusiasm. It spread over central Europe, went into Austria; it seized hold of crafty old Metternich, who had been the high priest of reaction for nearly forty years, and pitched him across where all ex-folks go, to England. Did it ever occur to you what a haven of refuge England is for those who have been? You notice that when an autocrat loses his job, he does not go to au-

tocracies for satisfaction, but he goes to democracies. It is a wonderful collection of ex-monarchs England has at the present time, and it is within the possibility of imagination, at least, that we shall yet see Mr. Romanoff and Mrs. Romanoff and all the little Romanoffs in England.

But in 1848 you find yourself confronting a sinister power that said democracy was going too far, a power that forced out Carl Schurz and those other men who did so much for democracy in the United States, a power which imprisoned and prosecuted in 1848 and which still imprisons, hangs and mutilates today in the name of those who hate democracy.

In 1848 we see this struggle intensifying. After the end of the wars of Napoleon, in 1815, that amazing Congress of Vienna was summoned, to divide up the world, in a way I suppose highwaymen would divide up loot. They carved and recombined Europe in the interest of Austria, Prussia, Russia and Great Britain; and France and French possessions were the victims. You will, perhaps, recall that when the Republic of Genoa had been tossed over to some king, the representatives of the republic complained to the czar, who was one of the most sentimental, beautiful souls that ever played the part of an iron-handed, bloody despot. The czar replied, "Republics are no longer fashionable." One hundred and two years after that remark Russia said to the czar, "Czars are no longer fashionable." The difference between those two fashions is the difference which measures the development of American ideals in the spread of democracy throughout the world. This autocratic power which, in 1815, was so firmly entrenched in Europe has gone down in a way that is hard to believe.

I must confess that I am a sort of converted pacifist. I have run nearly the whole gamut of doubts during this war, but the scales are at last removed from my eyes by facts. It is an unpleasant awakening, the awakening that comes to a man when he finds he has mistaken things that he thought ought to be for the things that

are. But now we must look with level eyes at the nation that has fought democracy.

In 1815 all of Germany was ablaze with the enthusiasm of liberalism. It had aroused the heart of abased Prussia until, enabled to face Napoleon, there had come the Battle of the Nations; Napoleon had been conquered. Liberalism seemed assured of the future. In 1818 Bavaria and Baden got constitutions. Württemberg in 1819; Hesse-Darmstadt in 1820. But Prussia was only told, "You shall have a constitution." The promise was not kept. The forces of reaction centering about Metternich of Austria forced Prussia into repressive action. A censorship was established over the press; a censorship was established in the universities. The librarians had to report what books professors took out over night to read. Prussia was kept in the grip of an autocratic government. There was no constitution. The conception of the State of Frederick the Great, which is that of a transcendental robbery, prevailed. Frederick the Great had built up his State by the loot of Silesia and Poland. His policy rules today. Prussia, not Germany, regards war as a part of politics. Prussia has grown by annexations and indemnities wrung from conquered nations. That is the way that Germany proposes to grow. That is what it is fighting for, to get annexations and indemnities. In 1851 a constitution was given Prussia. But it was a constitution which recognized no responsible government whatever, that assumed the king was called from heaven, that made the prime minister responsible to nobody except the king, that provided that the lower house should be elected by electors who are elected themselves by three groups of voters, each group being determined by those who pay a certain amount of taxes. A rich man may elect the elector from the first group, another rich man may do the same for the second group and all the rest of the voters elect the third elector. Then these electors choose the members of an assembly that has little power beyond de-

bate. The real government of Prussia is the king. The people are ruled.

The other day we read in the newspapers that the King of Prussia, who also is Emperor of Germany, announced that in view of the fact that his people had acted so well in war, he thought there ought to be some modification of the electoral system in Prussia. As a Yankee, I "rather guess" there will be—and perhaps sooner than we expect.

Then came Bismarck. You will recall the method he adopted, the straightaway method to get into war, to get territory and indemnities. First, he manipulated diplomacy with Denmark concerning Schleswig-Holstein. He got Schleswig-Holstein in the grip of Prussia and Austria with the express purpose of getting into war with Austria so Prussia might supplant Austria as the leader of German affairs. To do that he had to make a secret treaty with Italy to the effect that Italy would declare war with Austria, provided that Austria and Prussia were at war within three months. Bismarck saw to it that the war came—one of Prussia's defensive wars. Within seven weeks Austria was defeated, and Prussia, enlarged by new territories, was established as the dominant force in Germany. Incidentally, Austria paid an indemnity of which Bismarck is said to have received 400,000 thaler.

Next came France, for France was too powerful. Deliberately Bismarck and von Moltke planned to have a war with France. Bismarck tells how in his autobiography. King Wilhelm did not want war. Bismarck, Moltke and Roon were in Bismarck's house awaiting word from the king as to the negotiations with France concerning the proposed establishment of a Hohenzollern as king of Spain. The king agreed to withdraw the nomination. Peace, till then threatened, seemed assured. The king telegraphed that the French ambassador asked for an audience to ask that the assurance might be given that the plan of Hohenzollern control of Spain would never be revived. The telegram gave no intimation of demand for that decision. The

three makers of modern Prussia were in despair. They wanted war. To quote Bismarck's account, "they dropped their knives and forks upon the table and pushed back their chairs. There was a long silence. We were all profoundly depressed. We had the feeling that the affair was sinking in the sands." Bismarck found a way out of the difficulty. He mutilated the dispatch and gave it to the papers. Then, says Bismarck, "We continued to eat with the best appetite." The despatch in its mutilated form made France believe Prussia was insulting France and Prussia believe that France was insulting Prussia. Therefore they went to war. Out of the war came humiliation for France, the inevitable indemnity, this time \$1,000,000,000, the annexation by Germany of Alsace-Lorraine and the establishment of the German Empire. And awful suffering in France. When one hears the German lamentations about the hypocrisy of England and the inhumanity of their blockade one's mind goes back to the German treatment of the French in 1870 and how they starved heroic Paris. Germany's lamentations are absurd in the light of German precedent.

The next step was simple. By this time militaristic expansion had become a fixed practice in Prussia. It gained control of all Germany by the organization of the Reichstag and by the powers put into the hands of the Bundesrath. And back of Prussia's dominance is the army. There is no possibility of any of the federated states of Germany doing anything against the will of Prussia. In 1870 Prussia got control of all Germany. France was beaten. The new autocracy swept over Austria; it got control of Austria in the Triple Alliance. It thought it got control of Italy, but politics, if they sometimes make strange bedfellows, sometimes find bedfellows quarreling with each other. Italy has rebelled. Austria is today a vassal state, with Germans determining its policy and commanding its army—a situation one may well watch. I am not commenting upon facts, but simply giving an

exposition of facts and the philosophy set forth in countless books and lectures of representative Germans.

The next step was to control the Balkan states. They protected Austria in her seizure of Bosnia and Herzegovina and backed her in the ultimatum to Serbia that led to the present war. Today Germany controls ruthlessly the Balkan states. In Serbia they have killed 750,000 people. And as to Bulgaria? I used to honor Bulgaria. A young Bulgarian told me of their struggle for liberty ten years ago; but today, after Austrian inspired treachery, Bulgaria first broke with Serbia after the first Balkan war and is a pawn in German politics.

Germany wanted Turkey, and for an obvious reason. Germany wanted commercial expansion in the East and an approach to the Persian Gulf. The Kaiser proceeded to get control of Turkey. I was in Palestine a short time after he had been there. I saw the roads they made for him and I heard how he announced himself as the protector of Islam. When the present war began the same Kaiser attempted to stir Mohammedans into a Holy War, and the same Kaiser has done nothing to stop the massacre of millions of Armenians. I have talked with men who saw parts of this massacre. I have read the accounts and I have seen pictures of the horrors in Armenia. One million Armenians killed! It is too horrible to think about were it not necessary to recall that horrors of the same kind—750,000 Serbians slaughtered; 4,000 Bohemians hanged; 30,000 Poles executed—are all a part of a national policy of terrorization. God knows what has happened in Belgium and northern France, too horrible to tell, accomplished systematically by the same relentless militaristic power that today is fighting civilization. I was told a story of how a missionary heard a certain Moslem giving a lecture on the war to a Mohammedan brother, and he said, "Kaiser Wilhelm has become a Mohammedan and he is waging war against the Christians, and all the Christians are waging war against him, and the evidence of it is here: He is destroying the churches

of the Christians." And he showed photographs of the cathedrals of northern France which had been ruined.

With Turkey in the hands of the autocratic power, the work went straight forward down to Bagdad and on down toward the Persian Gulf. The erection of a great militaristic power in central Europe, reaching from the North sea to Mesopotamia, if peace were to be declared today, would be an accomplished fact. The United States has nothing to say regarding the expansion of a state in an economic fashion, but when you see a great militaristic autocracy without a modern constitution, without representative control or responsible government, organizing 177,000,000 people into its militaristic mould, then you see that an intervention is intended by God Almighty with such a power; that it means the conquest of the world by the power that has broken treaties, ravaged Belgium, crushed Serbia and commandeered Austria. For the next step is clear. They announced it themselves. England was to be crushed. Somebody asked a representative of Germany in America why they thought they could invade Belgium and he replied that the Germans thought Belgium would prefer peace to honor—the cynicism of it!—but neither Belgium nor England preferred peace to honor. Of course South America was also included in the plan. Colonies were placed in South America ready to rise. But they did not rise! Twice, at least, the Monroe Doctrine has brought us within striking distance of war because of the attitude of Germany, and we would have had war had it not been for England, who, almost as much as we, is responsible for the Monroe Doctrine.

And the United States was in this program of world-power. In 1903 a friend of mine went through all of Germany for the purpose of engaging prominent men to speak at one of the great meetings at the St. Louis Exposition. He was told at that time that Germany would have to fight America. He said he could not understand why, and the reply was this: "You are

not a nation. You are today trade rivals with us and we have got to fight you." But Germans must conquer England before they can reach us. We always make allowances for that sort of a thing when we hear anybody bragging about America, and we could not take German boasts except in the same spirit. But today we see a psychological difference. When Germans are uncertain of success they brag; an Englishman, when he is sure of success, grumbles. So today we listen alike to German boastfulness and English complaints hopefully. We know the bull dog. When he complains he is just setting his teeth a little harder! We are not fighting England's war. England is fighting democracy's war.

I was in Japan a couple of years ago and Count Okuma told me, as he has told others, of the persistent efforts of Germany to make trouble between Japan and the United States over China. I reported this and people thought it was not true. After the Zimmermann note have you any doubt whether it was true? There is still a persistent, organized effort to create bad feeling between Japan and the United States. Yesterday a man who is in close touch with the whole propaganda against the United States told me of a German committee established in Tientsin at the present time. Do you see any connection between that and the distortion of a note which was sent to China by the United States?

Face this entire program of Germany. Could anything be clearer that it makes war the basis of the imperial program? It is autocracy's method of expansion. War, annexations, indemnities. German autocracy is at work in Austria, the Balkan States, Serbia, Japan, China, India and South America. Germany is able to build up a state with overhead efficiency because it controls an army and builds the state on an army. This is not comment on my part, but is the express philosophy of Prussian writers. You will find pages to that effect not only in Bernhardi, but in almost every German treatise on politics and history.

Let us now look at our own policy, at democracy's policy in international affairs: We started this great democratic movement in 1776 and we have extended it into international relations. In consequence there has come from our international relations a new conception of the relationship of states. I wish it were possible to estimate this fact as it deserves. A few years ago thousands of people in Japan suspected the United States of trying to do to Japan what many in this country thought Japan was trying to do to the United States. In 1915 I was able to show Japanese the contrary. I could point out things which were unique—Cuba, handed back to herself twice. But today I could refer to that glorious bit of poetic justice, that when we were going to war for our self-defence, one of the first countries to offer us her aid was little Cuba. That illustrates the power of democracy in international affairs. Democracy never has to coerce allies. Allies come contagiously to democracy. Look at Canada. Is there anything more glorious in history than Canada sending hundreds of thousands of troops across the ocean for the defence of democracy and the Empire? Canada is under no compulsion to do that. It is as free as the United States. But it is a part of British democracy. Then we have Australia, New Zealand and the new republic of South Africa. There is nothing quite like their attitude in history except American democracy, which, having split in civil war, came together in a closer union than ever before. The people of South Africa fought Great Britain and after they fought Great Britain and taught Great Britain how to fight, they succumbed, though not because they were any the less brave than Great Britain. They organized a republic. Great Britain welcomed to the control of the new government the very generals who had led the Boers. And when autocracy tried to crush Great Britain the republic of South Africa came forward as bravely as Canada or the New Zealanders to defend a former enemy who had become almost a mother country.

Democracy makes friends because democracy is a lesson in the recognition of the rights of others. When you have an empire bound together by a great ideal you have something more powerful than the German Empire. Look at the efficiency of democracy! I am speaking about England, because there is a pro-German propaganda now on to discredit England. I know directly about the matter. Whenever you hear anyone talking against Great Britain, take him aside and say, privately but very distinctly, "My friend, either consciously or unconsciously"—and emphasize those words, because it will make him think—"consciously or unconsciously you are engaged in a pro-German propaganda." I think you will be interested to know I was told yesterday that under the stress of revelations which are being made regarding this propaganda the committee having it in charge left an American city and went to Mexico. Maybe Mexico will find them out.

While I am speaking about Great Britain look at democracy's efficiency a moment. When this war broke, England had at its disposal no army to speak about. It had less than 100,000 men, who were sent to certain death. They fought all day with an army that had been preparing for forty years. They fought them by day and they retreated at night, they fought and they retreated practically an entire week, until at last—and this was no "strategic retreat"—until at last "Papa" Joffre got his troops together and the Battle of the Marne was fought.

In passing I will say, in a recent book called "Hurrah and hallelujah" (Doran, New York, 1917)—doubtless you have given it out—there is a quotation from Adolph Harnack, the great historian, in which he describes the wonderful movement of German troops in 1914. He says, at the tail end of a sentence: "Then we withdrew to strengthen our line from such a place to such a place." That was his account of the Battle of the Marne. Yet Germany says England started the war! Today Great Britain has 5,000,000 men

under arms, holding 120 miles of line in the very storm center of the war. And instead of a single line of soldiers they have troops five or ten miles back; they have guns enough to stand wheel to wheel the whole 120 miles, and munitions enough to blow up an entire hill as part of the day's work. That is what democracy does when it actually begins to do things.

We were unprepared for this war because we are democrats. We have been trying to live like gentlemen amongst nations. We could not believe that other nations were not doing likewise. We now see some of them were not. They have discovered that we have discovered the fact!

Democracy has given liberty to every land it has conquered. Take the Philippines, for instance. As fast as we can educate the Filipinos in the affairs of self-government they are given a share in the conduct of their government.

When democracy conquers it pays indemnity. After we had taken an all but uninhabited territory from Mexico we paid her \$15,000,000. After we had taken Guam and the Philippine Islands from Spain we paid Spain \$20,000,000. Do you suppose the Prussian-German autocracy will pay indemnity if it conquers? During the Boxer uprising in China we went to China and protected China; and after the terrible Boxer business indemnities were demanded of China to the amount of nearly half a billion dollars. Our share was approximately \$20,000,000. We could not stand for that, so we took a few hundred thousand dollars to rebuild the buildings the Boxers destroyed and settle other damages, and then we turned back the remainder to China. And China uses it for educating Chinese youths in the United States. And we had a precedent for this action. For in 1868 we joined in a brief war against Japan. When it was over Japan paid an indemnity. Our share was \$800,000. But we never used the money. In 1883 we paid it back with interest.

This is the new attitude democracy has engendered toward the weaker nations.

We have come to the place where democracy, or a representative government of some sort that is really responsible, is established in every great nation of the world with the exception of Germany, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria. Russia is becoming a republic, China is becoming a republic, and Japan, although it is not a republic yet, has an element of control over the cabinet that makes its government responsible. And now the two great movements have come across each other. We did not go into this war. The war went into us. We did not want the war. We tried to stave it off for more than two years. We have passed through various attitudes. We have passed through the scientific stage, setting forth facts. We have written theses about it, printed books about it; we have seen the geographic and economic background of it. We have said, "Here is a chance to get South American trade," and we have seen in it an opportunity to aid the wounded and the unfortunate. And then it burst upon us that it was we who were being attacked; that the great struggle in Europe was a struggle in which our own institutions were attacked; that the destruction by submarines was of our own future as well as of international law.

Our war of 1776 was really a declaration of independence of the United States from the rest of the world. Our entrance into this war is a declaration of our interdependence on the whole movement of democracy. We are part and parcel of a world epoch. We are re-living the days I used to study and teach of the American Revolution, when liberty meant something—when people meant something—worth dying for.

I see today the rise of a new American spirit of loyalty to the ideals of our constitution. Modern democracy is our contribution to the world's history. When I see the British rolling back the Turks in the Tigris valley, refusing to stay beaten by Turkey and capturing Bagdad, I feel that the democracy of America is there. When I see the line of trenches running

from sea to sea and the resistless courage of those brave sons of France, I feel the democracy of America is at work. And I am glad that now our own sons are to share in the crushing of autocracy. Our business is not to enforce democracy on Germany, but to "make the world safe for democracy," as President Wilson so wonderfully said. We believe that after this war the democratic forces of Germany will be given an opportunity to release that liberal Germany that has been repressed since 1815; that liberal Germany will anew come to a sense of those splendid ideals

which it used to teach the world; that the liberals of Germany will be able to establish a constitution that shall be a fit companion of the English, the American and the French constitutions; that out of this awful world struggle will come for all the world—for Germany most of all—the victory of those ideals which our fathers organized and defended, which we have embodied in our life, and which we and the British and the French have carried around the world—these ideals of a "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

BOOKS IN CAMP, TRENCH AND HOSPITAL*

BY THEODORE WESLEY KOCH, *Chief Order Division, Library of Congress*

ABRIDGED BY ARTHUR E. BOSTWICK

Books and magazines are being supplied in great numbers to the British troops through four agencies: (1) The British Red Cross and Order of St. John War Library; (2) The Camps Library; (3) The Young Men's Christian Association, and (4) The British Prisoners of War Book Scheme (Educational). With this paper, I am sending an exhibit of specimens of the kind of books and magazines which have proved most useful in entertaining and instructing the men. I have not sent standard authors, but rather literature popular with Tommy Atkins and Jack Tar, but unknown to most Americans.

No time should be lost in interesting those who have the means, the leisure and the executive ability to see that similar work is started at once in the United

States. Co-operation or affiliation with the British organizations should be considered.

1. The War Library

The night after the war had been declared, Mrs. H. M. Gaskell lay awake wondering how she could best help in the coming struggle. Recalling how much a certain book she had read during a recent illness had meant to her, she realized the value of providing literature for the sick and wounded. A few days later she dined with some friends and talked over this opportunity for service, with the result that Lady Battersea decided to lend her splendid mansion, Surrey House, Marble Arch, for the work.

The call for books was the first appeal of the war, and newspapers were glad to give their space and support free. To the surprise of the organizers the overworked volunteers were soon unable to keep up with the unexpected volume of gifts. It was necessary to hire empty wagons to stand at the door for the refuse, for many people had seized this as an opportunity to clean out their rubbish piles. To offset

*Mr. Koch's paper, written in London, has been published there by J. M. Dent & Sons, with preface by Mr. J. Y. W. MacAlister, president of the British Library Association, and a postscript by Dr. C. T. Hagberg Wright. (8vo. 48 pp. 1s. 6d.) With the exception of a few passages not received in time for insertion, Mr. Koch's paper was printed in the *Library Journal*, July, August, 1917. Supplementary chapters appeared in the *Library Journal* for October, 1917.